



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/678,516	10/03/2000	Randy Gray Simmons	17499	5361

7590 02/18/2003

Tyco Technology Resources  
4550 New Linden Hill Road  
Suite 450  
Wilmington, DE 19808-2952

EXAMINER

GUSHI, ROSS N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2833

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/678,516

Applicant(s)

SIMMONS ET AL.

Examiner

Ross N. Gushi

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/23/02 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-10 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Essential matter regarding the technical specifications of "RJ-xx series" connectors critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

An application as filed must be complete in itself in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112. An application for a patent when filed may incorporate "essential material" by reference to (1) a U.S. patent, (2) a U.S. patent application publication, or (3) a pending U.S. application, subject to the conditions set forth below. "Essential material" is defined as that which is necessary to (1) describe the claimed invention, (2) provide an enabling disclosure of the claimed invention, or (3) describe the best mode

(35 U.S.C. 112). In any application which is to issue as a U.S. patent, essential material may not be incorporated by reference to (1) patents or applications published by foreign countries or a regional patent office, (2) non-patent publications, (3) a U.S. patent or application which itself incorporates "essential material" by reference, or (4) a foreign application. See MPEP Section 608.01(p). The subject matter incorporated by reference at applicant's specification page 1, line 20 – page 2, line 5 is essential material which may not be incorporated by reference. Applicant's claimed invention includes references to various standards which are may not be incorporated by reference. The limitations regarding technical requirements of "RJ-standards" are given no weight.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oliphant et al. '714 ("Oliphant"). Oliphant discloses a modular jack connector assembly comprising a dielectric housing having a front and rear orientation and defining at least one receptacle 116 adapted for receiving a mating plug; and a plurality of contacts (150) disposed in said housing, each contact being secured to a rear portion of said housing, each contact extending forward in said receptacle from said rear portion to a free end such that a portion of said contact forward of said rear portion electrically connects with a mating plug when the mating plug is received within said receptacle, said housing has a rear side defining a slot suitable for receiving an edge of a circuit board 24, and wherein a connection portion of each contact extends from said rear portion of said housing into said slot (see figure 9) such that when said housing is mounted to a circuit board a portion of said connection portion makes contact with the circuit board.

Per claim 13, the Oliphant housing comprises one receptacle.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 4 – 12, and 16 - 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliphant as in claim 1.
2. Oliphant discloses a modular jack connector assembly comprising a dielectric housing having a front and rear orientation and defining at least one receptacle adapted

Art Unit: 2833

for receiving a mating plug; and a plurality of contacts disposed in said housing, each contact being secured to a rear portion of said housing, each contact extending forward into the receptacle from said rear portion to a free end such that a portion of said contact forward of said rear portion electrically connects with a mating plug when the mating plug is received within said receptacle, said housing has a rear side defining a slot suitable for receiving an edge of a circuit board, and wherein a connection portion of each contact extends from said rear portion of said housing into said slot such that when said housing is mounted to a circuit board a portion of said connection portion makes contact with the circuit board. To the extent that Oliphant is not explicit in stating that the mating plugs are RJ "standard" compliant, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to have the connector be mateable with "RG standard compliant" plugs. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to allow the connector to be used with standardized parts, as suggested in Oliphant, col. 5, lines 1-6, and as is well known in the art.

3. Regarding claims 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 23, regarding the relative dimensions, strengths, and proportions of the contact, to the extent that Oliphant does not detail relative dimensions, strengths, and proportions of the contacts, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art that the contact dimensions, strengths, or proportions could be varied as desired. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been for example to improve durability and to obtain desired compliance, such motivations being well known in the art. Furthermore, the claimed variations in relative sizes, proportions, or dimensions, of

Art Unit: 2833

the contacts, where the claimed device does not perform differently compared to the prior art device, do not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338 (Ct. App. Fed Cir. 1984).

4. Regarding claims 21-23 and 8-10, to the extent that Kinoshita is not explicit in stating that the connector is configured to receive RJ-45 or RJ-11 "standard" plugs, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to construct the Oliphant device so as to receive standard plugs. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to allow the connector to be used with standardized parts, as is well known in the art.
5. Claims 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliphant as in claim 1 in view of Laity '962. Oliphant discloses a single receptacle housing, not a housing with two or more receptacles. Laity discloses a connector including a plurality of RJ-type receptacles. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify the Oliphant connector to accommodate a plurality of RJ-type receptacles, as taught in Laity. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to allow electrical connection to the circuit board via a variety of plugs or to connect the board to a variety of devices, as taught in Laity.
6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laity '962 in view of Oliphant as in claim 1. Laity discloses a PCMCIA card comprising a card housing, a circuit board mounted in the card housing, and a modular jack connector comprising a housing and contacts. Arguably the Laity contacts are not secured at a rear portion of the housing. At the time of the invention, it would have

been obvious to use the Oliphant connector in the Laity card. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the space required for the assembly as taught Oliphant (col. 3, line 2).

Claims 1, 24, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston in view of Free et al. Johnston discloses a modular jack connector assembly comprising a dielectric housing 25 having a front and rear orientation and defining at least one receptacle adapted for receiving a mating plug; and a plurality of contacts (27) disposed in said housing, each contact being secured to a rear portion of said housing, each contact extending forward in said receptacle from said rear portion to a free end such that a portion of said contact forward of said rear portion electrically connects with a mating plug when the mating plug is received within said receptacle.

Johnston does not disclose a slot for receiving a circuit board. Free discloses a similar connector including slot 96 suitable for receiving an edge of a circuit board 24, where a connection portion of each contact extends from said rear portion of the housing into said slot such that when said housing is mounted to a circuit board a portion of said connection portion makes contact with the circuit board.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to replace the Johnston apertures 52 with a slot as taught in Free. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate connection of the connector to a board rather than to wires, as taught in Free.



Per claim 24, each contact consists of the free end connected to an upwardly angled section contacted to an elongated arm which is connected to the connection portion.

Per claim 25, the connection portion is curved around the rear portion to anchor the contact in the housing.

7. Regarding claim 26, to the extent that the particular angle in Johnston is not detailed, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to vary the angles as desired. workable angles would have been a matter of routine experimentation. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618 (CCPA 1977). See In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955)(Where general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover optimal or workable ranges by routine experimentation).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/30/02 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

The prior indication of allowable subject matter is withdrawn.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ross Gushi whose telephone number is (703) 306-4508. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley, can be reached at (703) 308-2319. The phone number for the Group's facsimile is (703) 308-7722

